



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,972	02/14/2002	Tomokazu Murakami	H-1026	4933

7590 10/04/2005  
Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C.  
Suite 370  
1800 Diagonal Road  
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

K

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/073,972	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MURAKAMI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Joshua Joo	<b>Art Unit</b> 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/14/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-9 are presented for examination.

### ***Specification***

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds the allowed maximum length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 2-7 are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - i) As per claim 4, "ULRs" is misspelled; the claim should read "URLs".
  - ii) As per claims 2-7, the dependent claims start with "A". Please change the claims to start with "The" since the claims are dependent on the invention of claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the invention is not limited to tangible embodiments (e.g., computer program.). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 6, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray et al, US Patent #6,636,237, in view of Schwalb et al, US Publication #2002/0144261 (Schwalb hereinafter).

7. As per claim 1, Murray teaches substantially the invention as claimed including the method and device for identifying and selecting objects of interest in a broadcast. Murray's teachings comprise of:

obtaining first content/object identifying information that identifies area defined for an object selected from the content of interest (Col 2, lines 10-14. Dynamic object.), and first reference information about the object within the defined area from said information registering equipment (Col 2, lines 21-23. Link is associated with the object.);

linking the first content/object identifying information, and the first reference information together and storing them into a database (Col 2, lines 21-23. Link is associated with the object. Col 2, lines 7-9. Storing information related to dynamic object.);

obtaining user-selectable region about an object selected from said content of interest from said information viewing equipment (Col 2, lines 21-23. Viewer selects dynamic object.);

comparing the thus obtained first and second user-selectable region specifics for matching (Col 2, lines 21-23; Col 3, lines 19-21. User selects dynamic object to display information. Compares user selected region with defined regions.); and

transmitting at least either the first content/object identifying information or the first reference information associated with the first keyword information to said information viewing equipment, according to the result of the matching (Col 2, lines 21-23. Link is accessed and information is displayed.).

8. Murray teaches of obtaining information regarding user's interests of objects by obtaining first and second user-selectable regions, and comparing the first and second user-selectable regions. However, Murray does not teach of obtaining information regarding user's interests by obtaining a first and second keyword information about an object selected from said content of interest from said information viewing equipment; and comparing the thus obtained first and second keyword information specifics for matching.

9. Schwalb teaches of obtaining a first and second keyword information (Paragraph 0041) from a TV or Internet broadcast, comparing the first and second keywords (Paragraph 0041), and providing information relating to the matching keywords (Paragraph 0042).

10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray and Schwalb because both teachings are related in that they deal with providing information that are related to viewers' interest. Therefore, the teachings of Schwalb to obtain keywords regarding content of interest and comparing the keywords would improve the teachings of Murray by providing an alternative method for users to identify and receive information regarding objects that are of interest to the user, where users

Art Unit: 2154

may describe the object of interest and receive information that are similar to user's requested keywords.

11. As per claim 2, Murray does not teach the computer program as recited in claim 1, wherein said process of information processing further includes, prior to said step of obtaining the second keyword information, the step of transmitting a list of registered keywords about the object selected from said content of interest to said information viewing equipment in response to inquiry made from said information viewing equipment.

12. Schwalb teaches of obtaining a list of keyword selections (Paragraph 0039.).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray and Schwalb because the teachings of Schwalb to provide a list of keywords for the user to select would improve the teachings of Murray by providing the user with the option of selecting predefined keywords, improving the user-friendliness of the Murray's system.

14. As per claim 3, Murray teaches the computer program as recited in claim 1, wherein:

said step of obtaining information from said information viewing equipment includes obtaining second content/object identifying information for an object selected from said content of interest (Col 2, lines 21-23. User selects dynamic object. Col 2, lines 31-34. Positional information for the object.);

said step of comparing for matching compares the first and second content/object identifying information specifics for matching (Col 2, lines 21-23; Col 3, lines 19-21. User selects object to display information. Compares user selected region with defined regions.); and

said process of information processing further includes the step of transmitting the first reference information associated with the first content/object identifying information (Col 2, lines 21-23. Link is accessed and information is displayed.) and the first keyword information to said information viewing equipment, according to the result of the matching (Fig. 2, #20; Col 1, lines 43-45. Information related to the object is displayed to the user.).

15. As per claim 6, Murray teaches the computer program as recited in claim 1, wherein:

said step of storing information into the database registers the first content/object identifying information (Col 2, lines 15-23. Stores information related to the dynamic object. Col 2, lines 31-34, 56-57. Positional information for the object.), and the first reference information (Col 2, line 21-23. Link.):

a reference information table having at least an ID field for uniquely identifying a record entry (Col 2, lines 21-23. Link is identified by the object.), and a reference information field to contain the first reference information (Col 2, lines 21-23. Specific information linked.), wherein one record entry comprises at least its ID, reference information, and the associated keyword ID. a target image object table having at least an ID field for uniquely identifying a record entry, a time and frame field to contain information to identify an object selected from said content of interest (Col 2, lines 31-34, 56-57. Positional information.), and an link ID field to contain the ID of reference information linked with the object, wherein one record entry comprises at least its ID, object information, and the ID of reference information linked with the object (Col 2, lines 21-23. Link is identified by the object.).

16. However, Murray does not teach of a first keyword information in the table; a keyword table having at least an ID field for uniquely identifying a record entry and a keyword field to

Art Unit: 2154

contain the first keyword, wherein one record entry comprises at least its ID and a keyword; and containing the keyword ID associated with the reference information.

17. Schwalb teaches of maintaining a list of keywords (Paragraph 0039; 0041), where the keyword is associated with an ad application (Paragraph 0042).

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray and Schwalb because both teachings are related in that they deal with identifying objects of the interest to the user. Therefore, the teachings of Schwalb to maintain keyword information comprising of a keyword and association to a reference information would improve the teachings of Murray by providing the user with an alternative method of identifying objects from a broadcast such as describing the object of interest, thus allowing the user to identify objects based on keywords and receive keyword related information as taught by Schwalb.

19. As per claim 9, Murray teaches substantially the invention as claimed including the computer program for identifying and selecting objects of interest in a broadcast. Murray's teachings comprise of:

making inquiry about the object selected from said content of interest to an information search equipment that is connected to said hardware resources by a network (Col 2, lines 11-14. Viewer selects dynamic object.);

receiving and displaying keyword information about the object selected from said content of interest from the information search equipment (Col 1, lines 43-44, Col 2, lines 20-24. Information is displayed to user based on the object selected.);



allowing for entering content/object identifying information that identifies the area defined for the object selected from said content of interest (Col 2, lines 11-14. Viewer selects dynamic object.);

transmitting the content/object identifying information to the information search equipment (Col 2, lines 21-24. Retrieves information related to the selected dynamic object.); and

receiving and displaying reference information associated with the content/object identifying information from the information search equipment (Col 2, lines 14-15. Information is displayed.).

20. However, Murray does not teach of allowing for selecting one or more keywords from the displayed keyword information; transmitting the selected keyword or keywords; and receiving and displaying reference information associated with the keyword information from the information search equipment.

21. Schwalb teaches of selecting a keyword from a keyword list (Paragraph 0039), transmitting the selected keyword to an information search equipment (Paragraph 0041), and displaying applications associated with the keyword information (Paragraph 0042).

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray and Schwalb because both teachings are related in that they deal with providing information that are related to viewers' interest. Furthermore, the teachings of Schwalb to select a keyword, transmit, and display reference information associated with the keyword information would improve the teachings of Murray by providing an alternative method for users to identify and receive information regarding objects that are of

Art Unit: 2154

interest to the user, where users would be allowed to identify and receive information based on keyword searches.

23. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray and Schwalb, in view of Ilan et al, US Publication #2002/0059184 (Ilan hereinafter).

24. As per claim 4, Murray teaches the computer program for obtaining first and second user-selectable regions, and comparing the first and second user-selectable regions to provide a user with information regarding the object of interest. Murray also teaches the said process of information processing further includes the step of transmitting the first content/object identifying information associated with the first reference information (Col 2, lines 16-18, 33-34, 56-57. Dynamic object contains positional information and is associated with a link.) and the first keyword information to said information viewing equipment, according to the result of the matching (Fig. 2, #20. Col 2, lines 43-45. Specific information regarding the object is send to the user.).

25. However, Murray does not teach said step of obtaining information from said information viewing equipment further includes obtaining second reference information about an object selected from said content of interest; and said step of comparing for matching compares ULRs or comments respectively included in the first and second reference information for matching or duplication.

26. Ilan teaches of obtaining first and second reference information (Paragraph 0022, 0023. URL) and comparing for matching URLs (Paragraph 0027; 0031)

Art Unit: 2154

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray, Schwalb, and Ilan because all three teachings are related in that they deal with different types of matching for objects of interests. Therefore, the teachings Ilan to obtain a second URL and compare URLs would improve the system of Murray and Schwalb by allowing the users to identify and receive information regarding users' objects of interest through alternative methods.

28. As per claim 7, Murray teaches the computer program as recited in claim 1, wherein:

said content of interest rendered by media is video image information distributed by TV broadcasting (Col 1, lines 45-46. Television program.);

said content/object identifying information includes at least any of a broadcasting channel number over which the content was or will be broadcasted, receiving area, specified time length, and target position/area that designates a part or all of an image object (Col 2, lines 31-34, 56-57. Positional information.);

29. However, Murray does not teach said keyword information includes at least any of a keyword, keyword ID number, keyword type, specified time length, time when the keyword was registered, and the number of times the keyword has been selected as user preference; and said reference information includes a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) that designates a Web site/page on the Internet

30. Schwalb teaches of maintaining keyword information (Paragraph 0039; 0041), where the keyword is compared with a viewer keyword and is associated with an ad application (Paragraph 0042).

Art Unit: 2154

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray and Schwalb because both teachings are related in that they deal with providing information that are related to viewers' interest. The teachings of Schwalb to maintain keyword information comprising of a keyword and association to a reference information would improve the teachings of Murray by providing the user with an alternative method of identifying objects from a broadcast, thus allowing the user to identify objects based on keywords and receive keyword related information as taught by Schwalb.

32. Ilan teaches of obtaining reference information (Paragraph 0022, 0023. URL) for objects of interest, and comparing and matching URLs (Paragraph 0027; 0031)

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray, Schwalb, and Ilan because all three teachings are related in that they deal with different types of matching for objects of interests. Therefore, the teachings Ilan for the reference information to be an URL would improve the system of Murray and Schwalb by allowing the users to identify and receive information regarding users' objects of interest from the Internet.

34. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray and Schwalb, in view of Schwalb, US Publication #2002/0120929.

35. As per claim 5, Murray teaches of defining the dynamic object upon a time period that the object is in during playback. The user is then able to select the dynamic object during the duration of the time period (Page 4, claims 4 and 5).

36. However, Murray does not teach the said step of comparing for matching determines: whether one keyword from the first keyword information and the other keyword from the second keyword information match or are duplicate ones; whether time length associated with the first keyword information and time length associated with the second keyword information match or are duplicate ones in addition to determining whether one keyword from the first keyword information and the other keyword from the second keyword information match or are duplicate ones, or whether time when the first keyword information was registered falls within the time length associated with the second keyword information in addition to determining whether one keyword from the first keyword information and the other keyword from the second keyword information match or are duplicate ones.

37. Schwalb teaches of determining whether the sub-stream keywords and viewer-entered keywords match (Paragraph 0041), and reading the time stamps of the sub-stream keywords for comparing and matching of the keywords (Page 5, claim 17).

38. Even though Murray and Schwalb do not explicitly teach of comparing time stamps, both prior arts do take into consideration of using time as a reference to identify and define the content of interest since a plurality of objects may appear in a single broadcast. It is well known in the art that broadcast is usually measured in respect to time, where objects and/or frames are identified through specific time periods. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray and Schwalb and to compare time stamps based on user selections on objects and keywords because matching keywords and comparing time stamps would improve the teachings of Murray by allowing the system to accurately determine which object of interest the user has selected during a broadcast.

Art Unit: 2154

39. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray, in view of Schwalb and Ilan.

40. As per claim 8, Murray teaches substantially the invention as claimed including the computer program for identifying and selecting objects of interest in a broadcast. Murray's teachings comprise of:

making inquiry about the object selected from said content of interest to an information search equipment that is connected to said hardware resources by a network (Col 2, lines 21-24. Viewer selects dynamic object.);

receiving and displaying keyword information about the object selected from said content of interest from the information search equipment (Fig. 2, #20; Col 1, lines 42-45, 21-23. Paragraph 0026; 0040. Information is displayed to the viewer based on the object selected.);

allowing for entering content/object identifying information that identifies the area defined for the object selected from said content of interest (Col 2, lines 21-23. Viewer selects dynamic object.);

transmitting the content/object identifying information to the information search equipment (Col 2, lines 20-24. Dynamic object is associated with the link.).

41. However, Murray does not teach of allowing for selecting one or more keywords from the displayed keyword information; allowing for entering reference information associated with the entered content/object identifying information; and transmitting the selected keyword or keywords, and the reference information to the information search equipment.

Art Unit: 2154

42. Schwalb teaches of receiving a selecting a keyword, and transmitting the selected keyword to an information search equipment (Paragraph 0039, 0041).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray and Schwalb because both teachings are related in that they deal with providing information that are related to viewers' interest. Furthermore, the teachings of Schwalb to select a keyword and transmit the selected keyword to an information search equipment would improve the teachings of Murray by providing an additional method for users to identify and receive information regarding objects that are of interest to the user, where users would receive information that are similar to user's requested keywords.

44. Ilan teaches of providing a reference information such as a URL and transmitting the reference information to an information search equipment (Paragraph 0023, 0031).

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Murray, Schwalb, and Ilan because all three teachings are related in that they deal with different types of matching for objects of interests. Therefore, the teachings Ilan to provide a reference information and transmit the reference information to an information search equipment would improve the system of Murray and Schwalb by allowing the users to identify and receive information regarding users' objects of interest through alternative methods.

### ***Conclusion***

46. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE

Art Unit: 2154

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

47. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8AM to 5PM and every other Friday.

48. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on 571 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

49. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 25, 2005  
JJ

  
JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100